REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claim 12 was amended to improve form. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The specification was objected to for informalities (i.e. embedded hyperlinks). In light of the presently submitted amendments to the specification, applicant submits the objectionable matter has been addressed. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly requested.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse this rejection, as the requirement set forth in the Office Action has been refuted by the USPTO Board of Appeals and Patent Interferences in the recently-published precedential opinion of *Ex Parte Lundgren* (Appeal No. 2003-2088), which can be reviewed in its entirety at http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/prec/2003-2088.pdf. As such, Applicant submits the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lennox et al.* ("A Language for User Control of Internet Telephony Services) in view of *Moshfeghi* (US Patent 6,467,833). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the feature of "defining a priority authorization level, which permits execution of instructions with wider ranging access rights in comparison to the instructions of the basic authorization level, for at least one priority user of the data processing system" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 11 and 12.

Regarding Lennox, the disclosure teaches various CPL script arrangements for call processing (see sections 2.1-2.3, pages 2-4). In the passages cited by the Office Action (sections 6.1-7.2, pages 20-27), the disclosure discusses a CPL location model (see also section 2.3, page 4), where signaling operations are dependent upon location sets, where location nodes may be added or removed. Under the disclosure, users may be authorized to access specific nodes, depending on whether or not they are in a specified location (section 6.1). Furthermore, authorization is conducted during connection to protect users against denial of service attacks (FIG. 28 and 29; section 14). However, nowhere in the disclosure of Lennox is it disclosed that a priority authorization level is used to permit execution of instructions with wider ranging

8

access rights. The proxy mode of page 25 has nothing to do with authorization, and merely prioritizes a list of alternate locations to which a call may be forwarded. Pages 40 and 43 merely describe a call set-up, where the code in FIG. 29 merely authenticates a user's SIP to a voicemail command and proxies that are associated with the user's location. Again, none of this relates to prioritized authorization.

Furthermore, Moshfeghi does not solve the deficiencies of Lennox, discussed above. The broadly cited passage of col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 32 teaches the use of embedded browser functions to prevent unauthorized linking (col. 3, lines 8-13; 26-30). Notwithstanding the fact that there is absolutely no teaching, suggesting or motivation to combine this teaching with Lennox, Moshfeghi also fails to teach prioritized authorization. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the present arguments, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (0112740-360) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____
Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
Customer No.: 29177
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: <u>December 22, 2005</u>